

REMARKS

Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for the careful consideration given to the present application. Applicants would also like to thank the Examiner for reviewing both groups of claims in order to make an independent determination that a restriction requirement was not necessitated by the instant claims because examination of both groups would not place an undue burden on the Examiner.

Applicants have amended claims 2, 4, and 6 and have added new Claim 22. Applicants note that the Examiner has allowed Claims 12 to 17 and has stated that claims 1 to 11 and 18-21 are neither taught nor suggested by the prior art.

The application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action, and Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are patentable in light of the foregoing amendments and following remarks.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. 112

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-11 and 18-21 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The Examiner has stated that it is unclear what constitutes a polymerizable resin because claim 2 appears to contrast with claim 1 in that claim 1 contains a resin while claim 2 contains reactants that form a resin. In light of this confusion, the Examiner is unclear whether claims 1 and 18 (it is believed that the Examiner incorrectly referenced claim 19) contain a resin or a mixture of monomers and oligomers. In order to alleviate this confusion, Applicants have amended claim 2, which now states that the polymerizable resin a product of the copolymerization of the components included in claim 2. It is believed that the amendment to claim 2 clarifies the confusion that the Examiner referenced and that, in light the amendment, it is clear that claims 1 and 18 contain a *resin*.

The Examiner has rejected claim 4 because the Examiner believes that it is confusing to state that the polyacrylate monomer is ethoxylated bisphenol A since ethoxylated bisphenol A is not an acrylate monomer. To remedy the confusion, Applicants have amended claim 4 to recite that the polyacrylate monomer is ethoxylated bisphenol A diacrylate. In light of the amendment

to claim 4, Applicants have also added new claim 22 to recite that the polyacrylate monomer of the in-mold coating composition is ethoxylated bisphenol A di(meth)acrylate.

Lastly, the Examiner has rejected claim 6 as confusing and seemingly inappropriate to state that the promoted peroxide further comprises an enolizable ketone, in light of the specification. Applicants have, accordingly, amended claim 6 to state that promoted peroxide further comprises a B-diketone.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the foregoing amendments and remarks are believed to put the subject application in condition for allowance and notice to that effect is hereby requested. Applicants would like to once again thank the Examiner for her attention to the subject Application. Any questions with respect to the foregoing may be directed to the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,
THE SHERWIN-WILLIAMS COMPANY

July 23, 2004

By: Arthi K. Tirey
Arthi K. Tirey
Attorney for the Applicants
Reg. No. 50,960
Phone: (216) 566-3650

The Sherwin-Williams Company
11 Midland Bldg. - Legal Dept.
101 Prospect Avenue, N.W.
Cleveland, Ohio 44115